1	THOMAS W. FERRELL, ESQ. (Bar No. 1156	05)	
	tferrell@higgslaw.com		
2	CHARLES F. REIDELBACH, JR., ESQ. (Bar No. 167482)		
3	reidelbach@higgslaw.com		
4	HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP 401 West "A" Street, Suite 2600		
5	San Diego, CA 92101-7913 TEL: 619.236.1551		
5	FAX: 619.696.1410		
6	MARK G. KACHIGIAN (OK Bar No. 4852)		
7	mkachigian@hjklaw.com		
8	CASSANDRA L. WILKINSON (OK Bar No. 20368)		
	cwilkinson@hjklaw.com		
9	HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN, P.C. 228 West 17th Place		
10	Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119 TEL: 918.587.2000		
11	FAX: 918.584.1718		
12	Attorneys for Defendants		
	Global Machinery Company,	T. 1	
13	GMCA Pty. Ltd., and Trapone Corporation Pty	. Ltd.	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
15			
16	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of	CASE NO. 08 CV 0233	
17	SORENSEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TRUST,	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION	
18	ŕ	FOR EXTENSION OF ANSWER DATE	
19	Plaintiff,	DATE: April 25, 2008	
20	v.	TIME: 11:00 a.m. Courtroom 15, 5 th Floor	
	GLOBAL MACHINERY COMPANY, an	Hon. Barry Ted Moskowitz	
21	Australian company; GMCA PTY. LTD., an Australian company; TRAPONE	No Oral Argument Unless	
22	CORPORATION PTY. LTD., an Australian	Requested by the Court	
23	company; and DOES 1-100,		
	Defendants.		
24		CMCA Pro Lot 177 Control	
25	Defendants Global Machinery Company, GMCA Pty. Ltd., and Trapone Corporation Pty		
26	Ltd. ("Defendants") hereby move the Court to extend their answer date until twenty (20) days		
27	after Defendants' Motion for Stay Pending Patent Reexamination is ruled upon if such Motion is		

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

28

denied, or twenty (20) days after the stay is lifted if such Motion is granted. In support of their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Motion, Defendants state as follows:

- Plaintiff Jens Erik Sorensen, as Trustee of Sorensen Research and Development 1. Trust ("Plaintiff") filed the present action against Defendants on February 5, 2008, alleging infringement of the '184 patent.
- 2. The '184 patent is currently the subject of two reexamination proceedings before the USPTO: reexamination application number 90/008,976 and reexamination application number 90/008,775.
- 3. The reexamination prosecution will likely result in a simplification of the issues to be considered by this Court.
- 4. Defendants were served on February 27, 2008. Therefore, Defendants' Answer is currently due March 18, 2008.
- 5. Defendants are filing a Motion for Stay Pending Patent Reexamination concurrently herewith.
- 6. Should the Motion for Stay be granted, the reexamination may result in a substantial alteration of the issues to be considered in this case. Therefore, Defendants will be in a better position to fully answer the Complaint at that time. In the interim, because of the stay, Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by an extension of the answer date. If the Motion for Stay is not granted, Defendants will answer within twenty (20) days. This delay is not significant, but rather extends the current answer date only long enough to allow this Court to consider the Motion for Stay and to allow the Defendants sufficient time to answer the Complaint. Therefore, Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the extension. The risk of this insignificant delay should the Motion for Stay be denied is more than outweighed by the benefits of extending the answer date until after the stay is lifted should the Motion for Stay be granted.
- Good cause exists for granting this Motion and an extension of the answer date 7. will unduly prejudice no party.

For the reasons explained above, Defendants respectfully request that the Court extend Defendants' answer date until twenty (20) days after Defendants' Motion for Stay Pending Patent Reexamination is ruled upon if such Motion is denied, or twenty (20) days after the stay is lifted

28

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO